

Revision: HCFA-PM-91-
1991

(MB)

ATTACHMENT 3.1-F
Page 1State/Territory: WISCONSINCOMMUNITY SUPPORTED LIVING ARRANGEMENTS SERVICES
PROVIDED TO THE DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED

1. Personal assistance.

Provided*: XNot Provided:

2. Training and habilitation services (necessary to assist the individual in achieving increased integration, independence and productivity).

Provided*: Not Provided: X

3. 24-hour emergency assistance (as defined by the Secretary).

Provided*: XNot Provided:

4. Assistive technology.

Provided*: Not Provided: X

5. Adaptive equipment.

Provided*: XNot Provided:

6. Support services necessary to aid an individual to participate in community activities.

Provided*: Not Provided: X*In accordance with the requirements specified in approved Form
HCFA-322.TN No. 92-0003

Records

No. NEWApproval Date JUN 29 1992Effective Date 1-1-92*Substitute page submitted on 4-14-92*

Revision: HCFA-PM-91-
1991

(MB)

ATTACHMENT 3.1-F
Page 2State/Territory: WISCONSIN

7. Other services (listed below)*:

- a) Daily living skills training
- b) Communication Aids
- c) Housing Modifications
- d) Respite
- e) Counseling and therapeutic resources
- f) Specialized transportation

*In accordance with the requirements specified in approved Form
HCFA-322.

TN No. 92-0003

Supersedes

TN No. NEWApproval Date JUN 29 1992Effective Date 1-1-92*Substitute page submitted on 4-14-92*

State Plan Amendment For CSLA

Wisconsin received approval as of April 1, 1992 to provide services under the Community Supported Living Arrangements (CSLA) as specified in section 1930 of then Social Security Act, as added by section 4712 of the Omnibus reconciliation Act of 1990.

Wisconsin proposes three changes to its approved CSLA program. The changes as follows:

1. Wisconsin proposes to increase the cost per person per day cap from \$100 per day to \$175 per day. This will allow Wisconsin to serve some additional individuals whose support needs are very intensive. While we still believe that most individuals' support needs can be met within the \$100/day cap, the increase will allow greater ability to serve our citizens with the most intense needs. In addition, we neglected to note in our original application that one-time-only costs for housing modifications or communication and adaptive aids are not counted into the cap.
2. Wisconsin has been able to expand CSLA to a greater geographic area. Wisconsin anticipated interest from a small number of counties. Based on a Request for Proposals process, Wisconsin has been able to allocate CSLA funding to 25 counties, not the anticipated nine. The effect of this is very positive as CSLA services will now be much more widely available than originally anticipated.
3. Wisconsin made a provision that, for monitoring boards that were other than established Long Term Support Committees, provider representation would be limited to no more than 10% of the membership. For small counties, this would mean a minimum board size of ten individuals if even one provider were on the board. We wish to change this requirement so no more than three members can be providers. This will allow for provider representation, but will not determine the size of the board.

The changes are on the attached form HCFA 322(5-91) Replacement Pages

TN:92-0013
Supercedes
New

Approved 8-17-92 Approval Date _____

REPLACEMENT PAGE 17

D. Description of CSLA ServicesGENERAL FUNDING GUIDELINES

Wisconsin has chosen to limit services to individuals based on cost; we will deny program participation to any individual whose CSLA services costs exceeds \$175 per day. It is important to note that we have chosen to cap only CSLA expenditures to the persons; if the addition of services funded through other sources (such as a state-funded supported employment program) results in an overall service plan that exceeds \$100 ⁷⁵ per day, this is acceptable. We are only choosing to limit CSLA services costs. We have chosen to do this in order to balance the needs of the persons within our chosen target group; by limiting the CSLA service costs within a relatively high cap we are still able to serve persons with severe disabilities and intensive needs while balancing our desire to accommodate a reasonable number of persons awaiting services. While individuals with intensive needs are clearly a group we intend to serve, individuals whose needs are less intensive are still in need of supports. We wish to include a fair cross-section of persons waiting for CSLA services in Wisconsin. Serving a range on individuals also responds to consumers who have informed the State that there are many individuals for whom minimal or at least less intensive services make the critical difference to eventual independence.

Wisconsin has chosen NOT to put a cap on the number of units of services for any one individual. Capping the units of service available to any one individual would unnecessarily limit individual support planning. The cap on the per diem cost of CSLA services provides enough control to manage the program within the funds available and allows for an appropriate case mix.

Wisconsin will allocate the funds to a maximum of ~~9~~ 25 county agencies who will compete for these funds using a Request for Proposal process. County agencies will have to demonstrate capability to meet the provider qualifications and all quality assurance and fiscal management requirements of CSLA to be selected. Each agency selected will receive a portion of the funds allocated according to their population and established waiting list. Once the funds are allocated to the county, the county may not exceed the maximum allocation but may, based on the Individual Support Plan, expend varying amounts of the funds for different individuals as long as any individual plan does not exceed the \$175 per day limit on CSLA services. Costs for one-time-only expenditures such as housing modifications and communication and adaptive aids will not be counted into the \$175/day cap. This will allow maximum flexibility locally and will also allow for developing support plans that are truly appropriate to the individuals' needs.

Form HCFA-332 (5-91)

TN:92-0013
 Supersedes
 New

Approved 8-17-92 Approval Date _____

REPLACEMENT PAGE 33

board; no more than 3 members of the board may be providers as while agencies should be represented, there may be conflicts of interest, particularly in a small county. No provider may participate in the monitoring of its own services in order to assure that there are no conflicts of interest.

- 3) The board must present a written report and hold a public meeting to present the results of its activities on an annual basis. The written report must be submitted to the Department as well. Any findings that pose serious threats to the health and safety of CSLA participants must immediately be reported to the county agency and Developmental Disabilities Office. An immediate action plan will be put into place, with the Developmental Disabilities Office holding lead responsibility for assuring corrective action.
- 4) Developmental Disabilities Office staff will review the reports submitted by the monitoring boards. Negative findings in these reviews will be incorporated into a plan of correction developed by the Developmental Disabilities Office in consultation with the monitoring board and the county agency.
- 5) To assure confidentiality, the written report and public meeting shall contain no identifying information as to the users of CSLA services. No information regarding specific individuals using CSLA services may be released to any party other than the state Department of Health and Social Services, Developmental Disabilities Office without the express written permission of the consumer and/or guardian. There must be at least one provider agency represented on the board; no more than 10% of the board may be providers as while agencies should be represented, there may be conflicts of interest, particularly in a small county.

Form HCFA-332 (5-91)

TN:92:0013
Supercedes
New

Approved: 8-17-92 Approval Date: _____